APPENDIX B: CRITICAL AREAS REGULATIONS

CRITICAL AREAS CHAPTER

SECTION 1.0 Purpose and objectives
SECTION 2.0 Establishment of critical areas: Provision for data maps
SECTION 3.0 Interpretation of data maps
SECTION 4.0 Effect of data maps: Applicability
SECTION 5.0 General provisions
SECTION 6.0 Critical areas; standards for site-specific analysis; development standards
SECTION 7.0 Warning and disclaimer of liability

SECTION 1.0
PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The regulations of this chapter are intended to protect critical areas, and satisfy the requirements of the Shoreline Management Act for critical areas protection as provided in WAC 173-26-221, in accordance with the Growth Management Act and through the application of the best available science, as determined according to WAC 365-195-900 through 365-195-925, and in consultation with state and federal agencies and other qualified professionals.

This chapter is to be administered with flexibility and attention to site-specific characteristics. It is not the intent of this chapter to make a parcel of property unusable by denying its owner reasonable economic use of the property or to prevent the provision of public facilities and services necessary to support existing development and planned for by the community without decreasing current service levels below minimum standards.[1]

The City's enactment or enforcement of this chapter shall not be construed for the benefit of any individual person or group of persons other than the general public.

SECTION 2.0
ESTABLISHMENT OF CRITICAL AREAS: PROVISION FOR DATA MAPS

2.1 List of Critical Areas

The incorporated area of the City of Wenatchee is hereby divided into the following critical areas, where appropriate, consistent with the best available science and the provisions herein:

[1] See RCW 36.70A.020(12).

A. Wetlands
B. Critical aquifer recharge areas
C. Fish and wildlife conservation areas
D. Frequently flooded areas
E. Geologically hazardous areas

All areas within the City of Wenatchee's shoreline jurisdiction meeting the definition of one or more critical areas, regardless of any formal identification, are hereby designated critical areas and are subject to the provisions of this chapter.

2.2 Data Maps

Critical areas are hereby designated on a series of data maps maintained at the business office of the Community and Economic Development Department. These maps contain the best available graphic depiction of critical areas and will be continuously updated as reliable data becomes available. These maps are for information and illustrative purposes only and are not regulatory in nature.

The critical areas data maps are intended to alert the development community, appraisers, and current or prospective property owners of a potential encounter with a use or development limiting factor based on the natural systems. The presence of a critical area designation on the data maps is sufficient foundation for the Administrator to order an analysis for the factor(s) identified prior to acceptance of a development application as being complete.

SECTION 3
INTERPRETATION OF DATA MAPS

3.1 Interpretation of Data Maps

The official charged with the administration of the Shoreline Master Program is hereby declared the Administrator of these regulations for the purpose of interpreting data maps. An affected property owner or other party with standing has a right to appeal the administrative determination to the Hearing Examiner using the procedure for appeals found in Chapter 7 of this Shoreline Master Program.

The data maps are to be used as a general guide to the location and extent of critical areas. Critical areas indicated on the data maps are presumed to exist in the locations shown and these critical areas and any associated buffers are protected under the provisions of this chapter and all other applicable provisions of the SMP. The exact location of critical areas shall be determined by the applicant as a result of field investigations performed by qualified professionals using the standards and definitions found in this SMP. All development applications are required to show the boundary(s) of all critical areas and any applicable buffers on a scaled drawing prior to the development application being considered "complete" for processing purposes.

SECTION 4
EFFECT OF DATA MAPS: APPLICABILITY

4.1 Effect of Data Maps

The conclusion by the Administrator that a parcel of land or a part of parcel of land that is the subject of a proposed development application is within the boundary(s) of one or more designated critical areas, as shown on the data maps, shall serve as cause for additional investigation and analysis to be conducted by the applicant. Development adjacent to an identified critical area will require additional investigation and analysis when the critical area is a fish and wildlife habitat conservation area or wetland and may require further review for other critical areas when there is sufficient information to determine a potential impact to or from the critical area for the development. The site specific analysis may be limited to those critical areas indicated on the data maps. In the event of multiple designations, each subject matter will be addressed independently and collectively for the purpose of determining development limitations and appropriate mitigating measures.

4.2 Applicability

A. When a chapter reference is used, it shall be inclusive of all of Appendix B.

B. This chapter classifies and designates critical areas in the city and establishes a process to apply appropriate protection measures for these critical areas in concert with all applicable provisions of the SMP. Any development authorized to alter the condition of any land, water or vegetation; or to alter or construct any building, structure or improvement shall be in compliance with the requirements of this chapter.

    1. This chapter applies to all real property, all land uses and development activity, and all structures and facilities within the corporate limits of the City of Wenatchee, Washington, as it is now configured or may, from time to time, be altered, whether or not a permit or authorization is required, and shall apply to every person, firm, partnership, corporation, group, governmental agency, or other entity that owns, leases, or administers land within the City of Wenatchee. No person, company, agency, or applicant shall alter a critical area or buffer except as consistent with the purposes and requirements of these regulations.
    2. Any individual critical area adjoined by another type of critical area within the shoreline jurisdiction shall apply the buffer standards and meet the requirements that provide the most protection of shoreline resources, when consistent with SMA policy.

SECTION 5
GENERAL PROVISIONS

5.1 The city shall not approve any permit or issue any authorization to alter the condition of any land, water or vegetation, or to construct or alter any structure or improvement in, over, or on a critical area or associated buffer, without first ensuring compliance with the requirements of this chapter.

5.2 No site analysis/report required by Section 6 of this chapter will be considered complete without a detailed resume of the principal author(s) which disclose(s) their technical training and experience and demonstrate their stature as a qualified professional(s).

A. Critical area site analysis/reports and decisions to alter critical areas shall rely on the best available science to protect the functions and values of critical areas and must give special consideration to conservation or protection measures necessary to preserve or enhance anadromous fish, such as salmon and bull trout, and their habitat.[2]

B. Any action taken pursuant to this chapter shall result in equivalent or greater functions and values of the critical areas associated with the proposed action, as determined by the best available science. Applicants must first demonstrate an inability to avoid or reduce impacts, before restoration and compensation of impacts will be allowed. No activity or use shall be allowed that results in a net loss of the ecological functions or values of critical areas, including lost time when the critical area does not perform impacted functions.

5.3 Surety. If a development proposal is subject to mitigation, maintenance or monitoring plans, an assurance device or surety may be required by the Administrator in accordance with Chapter 7 of the SMP.

5.4 The preparation of site analysis/reports or information and materials required by this Chapter are the responsibility of the applicant.

5.5Prior to accepting any application or issuing any authorization to alter the condition of any land, water or vegetation, or to construct or alter any structure or improvement, the data maps shall be consulted for the purposes of determining whether or not the property subject to the application is within any area shown as a critical area or associated buffer. The Administrator shall make available to applicants resources and information on the type(s) of critical areas and/or buffers that may be present. Information shall be provided to the applicant on the type of evaluation and site-specific analysis that will be required as a supplement to the

[2] See RCW 36.70A.172(1).

application materials necessary to bring the application up to a standard that can be characterized as "complete" and eligible for processing.
If the subject property does not lie within or partly within the critical areas or associated buffers as depicted on the data maps, the application will be considered complete, provided the application requirements of the Shoreline Master Program or other ordinances governing the process at issue are satisfied.

5.6 Fees. The City of Wenatchee shall establish fees for filing of a critical area review processing, and other services provided by the City of Wenatchee as required by this chapter. These fees shall be based on the anticipated sum of direct costs incurred by the city for any individual development or action and may be established as a sliding scale that will recover all of the costs including the enforcement of these code provisions. Basis for these fees shall include, but not be limited to, the cost of engineering and planning review time, cost of inspection time, costs for administration, and any other special costs attributable to the critical area review process.

5.7 Administrative Procedures. The administrative procedures followed during the critical area review process shall conform to the standards and requirements of the associated application type in the Shoreline Master Program as provided in Chapter 7 of the SMP. When no other application review process is required, final site analysis/reports or analysis and information required for development by this Chapter shall be reviewed and approved pursuant to the permitting process as provided for in sections 7.5.4-5 of Chapter 7 of the SMP.

SECTION 6
CRITICAL AREAS; STANDARDS FOR SITE-SPECIFIC ANALYSIS: DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

6.1 Critical Areas. Critical areas identified pursuant to the provisions of this Chapter are subject to the following minimum requirements as categorized for each applicable critical area below.

A. Wetlands

1. Wetlands, as defined within Chapter 8 of this SMP, shall be identified and delineated in the City of Wenatchee to reflect the relative function, value and uniqueness of the wetland using the Federal Manual for Identifying and Delineating Jurisdictional Wetlands (1987, as amended); and the US Army Corps of Engineers, (2006), and Interim Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region. The City of Wenatchee may use the following information sources as guidance in identifying the presence of wetlands and the subsequent need for a wetland delineation study in addition to the provisions for data maps identified in sections 2-4 of this Chapter:

a. Hydric soils, soils with significant soil inclusions, and "wet spots" identified within the Chelan County soil survey;
b. National Wetlands Inventory;
c. Previous wetland rating evaluation; and
d. On-site inspection.

2. A Site analysis/Report – required for the purpose of establishing an exact wetland boundary where development is associated with wetlands or a wetland buffer identified by this Chapter. Field delineation of the boundary is required and a scaled map must be produced. The *Washington State Wetland Rating System for Eastern Washington* (Ecology Publication #04-06-015, or as revised and approved by Ecology) must then be applied to the wetlands area to establish the category(s) of wetlands in evidence. The analysis required by this subsection shall be done by qualified professional or the Washington Department of Ecology.
3. A Wetland Analysis is required for wetlands identified by this Chapter, addressing the following minimum requirements:
   a. Categorize the wetland/s per the '*Washington State Wetland Rating System for Eastern Washington*', as amended.
   b. Establish the wetland buffers based upon Department of Ecology's Wetland guidance in Alternative 3 in Wetlands in Washington State, Volume 2, as amended. More specifically found in Appendix 8-D 'Buffer Alternative 3' attached to this chapter as Exhibit "A" of this Appendix.
   c. If impacts to the wetland or buffers are to occur, provide a mitigation plan identifying the impacts and associated mitigation consistent with Department of Ecology's guidance in '*Guidance on Wetland Mitigation in Washington State – Part 2: Developing Mitigation Plans (Version 1)*', Ecology Publication #06-06-011b, Olympia, WA, March 2006 or as revised.
   d. Flexibility in mitigation is allowed provided that the mitigation is consistent with Department of Ecology's guidance in '*Wetlands in Washington State – Volume 1: A Synthesis of the Science'* (Washington State Department of Ecology Publication #05-06-006, Olympia, WA, March 2005); '*Wetlands in Washington State – Volume 2: Guidance for Protecting and Managing Wetlands*' (Washington State Department of Ecology Publication # 05-06-008, Olympia, WA, April 2005); '*Selecting Wetland Mitigation Sites Using a Watershed Approach'* (Washington Department of Ecology Publication # 10-06-007, Olympia, WA, November 2010) or can be supported by Best Available Science.
   e. Wetland analysis must ensure that "No net loss of wetland area and functions including lost time when wetland does not perform the function" is met .
   f. Mitigation ratios are found in the following table (Table 8D-11 Mitigation ratios for projects in Eastern Washington, Wetlands in Washington State, Volume 2'):

Category and Type of Wetland Impacts	Re-establishment or Creation	Rehabilitation Only[1]	Re-establishment or Creation (R/C) and Rehabilitation (RH)[1]	Re-establishment or Creation (R/C) and Enhancement (E)[1]	Enhancement Only[1]
All Category IV	1.5:1	3:1	1:1 R/C and 1:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 2:1 E	6:1
All Category III	2:1	4:1	1:1 R/C and 2:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 4:1 E	8:1
Category II Forested	4:1	8:1	1:1 R/C and 4:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 6:1 E	16:1
Category II Vernal pool	2:1 Replacement has to be seasonally ponded wetland	4:1 Replacement has to be seasonally ponded wetland	1:1 R/C and 2:1 RH	Case-by-case	Case-by-case
All other Category II	3:1	6:1	1:1 R/C and 4:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 8:1 E	12:1
Category I Forested	6:1	12:1	1:1 R/C and 10:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 20:1 E	24:1
Category I based on score for functions	4:1	8:1	1:1 R/C and 6:1 RH	1:1 R/C and 12:1 E	16:1
Category I Natural Heritage site	Not considered possible[2]	6:1 Rehabilitation of a Natural Heritage site	R/C Not considered possible[2]	R/C Not considered possible[2]	Case-by-case
Category I Alkali	Not considered possible[2]	6:1 rehabilitation of an alkali wetland	R/C Not considered possible[2]	R/C Not considered possible[2]	Case-by-case
Category I Bog	Not considered possible[2]	6:1 Rehabilitation of a bog	R/C Not considered possible[2]	R/C Not considered possible[2]	Case-by-case

[1] These ratios are based on the assumption that the rehabilitation or enhancement actions implemented represent the average degree of improvement possible for the site. Proposals to implement more effective rehabilitation or enhancement actions may result in a lower ratio, while less effective actions may result in a higher ratio. The distinction between rehabilitation and enhancement is not clear-cut. Instead, rehabilitation and enhancement actions span a continuum. Proposals that fall within the gray area between rehabilitation and enhancement will result in a ratio that lies between the ratios for rehabilitation and the ratios for enhancement.

[2] Natural Heritage sites, alkali wetland, and bogs are considered irreplaceable wetlands because they perform some special functions that cannot be replaced through compensatory mitigation. Impacts to such wetlands would therefore result in a net loss of some functions no matter what kind of compensation is proposed.

4. Buffer Standards
    a. Wetland buffer zones shall be retained in their natural condition. Where buffer disturbance is unavoidable during adjacent construction, re-vegetation will be required with native plant materials preferred.
    b. A Buffer zone shall be required adjacent to, and outside of, all regulated wetlands, including any wetland restored, relocated, replaced or enhanced because of wetlands alterations.
    c. All buffers shall be measured from the wetland edge as delineated in the field. The buffer zone depths may be reduced up to no more than 25% or averaged if a special site analysis/report demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Administrator, or if the Administrator otherwise determines, that the adjacent land is, and will remain, extensively vegetated, is topographically remote from the wetland, and that no direct or indirect adverse impacts on the regulated wetlands is reasonably likely as a result of the buffer reduction.
    d. Buffer averaging may not be used in conjunction with any other buffer reduction methods.
    e. Buffer averaging may be used under the following conditions:
        i. Averaging to improve wetland protection may be permitted when all of the following conditions are met:
            (a) The wetland has significant differences in characteristics that affect its habitat functions, such as a wetland with a forested component adjacent to a degraded emergent component or a "dual-rated" wetland with a Category I area adjacent to a lower rated area.
            (b) The buffer is increased adjacent to the higher-functioning area of habitat or more sensitive portion of the wetland and decreased adjacent to the lower functioning or less sensitive portion.
            (c) The total area of the buffer after averaging is equal to the area required without averaging.
            (d) The buffer at its narrowest point is never less than 3/4 of the required width
        ii. Averaging to accommodate otherwise allowed development of a parcel may be permitted when all of the following are met:
            (a) There are no feasible alternatives to the site design that could be accomplished without buffer averaging.
            (b) The averaged buffer will not result in degradation of the wetland's functions and values as demonstrated by a report from a qualified wetland professional.
            (c) The total buffer area after averaging is equal to the area required without averaging.
            (d) The buffer at its narrowest point is never less than 3/4 of the

required width.

5. Development
    a. The following activities are allowed to occur on wetlands and wetland buffer zones: passive outdoor recreational activities, existing and ongoing agricultural activities (provided no additional area is added beyond demonstrable historic levels), maintenance of existing facilities, structures, ditches, roads and utility systems.
    b. A legally established use or structure established prior to the effective date of this SMP which does not conform to standards set forth herein, is allowed to continue and be reasonably maintained provided that such activity or structure shall not be expanded or enlarged in any manner that increases the extent of its' nonconformity.

B. Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas
    1. Site analysis/Report – required for the purpose of delineating the recharge areas on a scaled development plan and provided detailed information on the following items:
        a. hydro-geological susceptibility to contamination and contamination loading potential
        b. depth to groundwater
        c. hydraulic conductivity and gradient
        d. soil permeability and contamination attenuation
        e. a vadose zone analysis including permeability and attenuation properties
        f. an analysis of the recharge area's toleration for impervious surfaces in terms of both aquifer recharge and the effect on water quality degradation
        g. a summary of the proposed development's effect on the recharge area concentrating on items "d" and "f"
        h. existing aquifer water quality analysis
    2. Development Standards
        a. The site analysis will create a water quality baseline which will serve as a minimum standard that shall not be further degraded by proposed development.
        b. The creation of additional impervious surfaces shall be limited to that amount described in the site analysis that will ensure adequate aquifer recharge and water quality protection.
        c. Development approvals shall ensure that all best management practices are employed to avoid introducing pollutants into the aquifer. This includes the complete collection and disposal of storm water outside of the aquifer recharge area for all development impervious surfaces.

C. Frequently Flooded Areas. The flood insurance rate maps (FIRM) and floodway maps along with the Flood Insurance Study prepared by the National Flood

Insurance Program (NFIP) are adopted as the formal designation for frequently flooded areas, specifically FIRM Panel #5300200005C and FIRM Panel #5300150625D as maintained by NFIP. When base flood elevation data is not available from the above information to designate frequently flooded areas, the Administrator shall obtain, review and reasonably utilize any base flood elevation data and floodway data available from federal and state governmental agencies or other sources including but not limited to historical data, high water marks or photographs of past flooding to make the appropriate designations.

1. Site analysis/Report – required to identify the location of the development in proximity to the one hundred year floodplain, and floodways where applicable.
2. Development Standards-The City of Wenatchee maintains flood hazard reduction standards administered under ordinances adopted under the building codes. The provisions of this Master Program provide additional standards for flood hazard that must be reviewed in concert with locally adopted building codes, and may be more restrictive or alter the design, location or nature of a development from the local standards. These policies and regulations are addressed specifically within Section 4.3 Flood Hazard Reduction of this SMP. Additional provisions within the SMP as a whole may also affect the design, location or nature of a development associated with frequently flooded areas, dependent upon the specific nature of the development.

D. Geologically Hazardous Areas
    1. Erosion Hazard
        a. Site analysis/Report – required to determine the exact location and circumstances that might be expected to precipitate a significant erosion event. The type and effectiveness of mitigating measures available to safeguard the public safety and welfare shall be addressed. The analysis shall also discuss the proposed development's influence on the erosion hazard and suggest appropriate design and development measures/standards that might be taken to minimize such hazards.
        b. Development Standards
            i. Erosion hazard areas shall be avoided as locations for building construction, roads or utility systems where mitigation is not feasible.
            ii. Development activities or their support infrastructure shall not be allowed that would directly or indirectly worsen the erosion hazard identified in the site analysis.
            iii. A minimum buffer shall be established at a horizontal distance from the top, toe, and along all sides of slopes shown to be high-risk or intermediate-risk slopes. Existing native vegetation within the buffer area shall be maintained and the buffer shall be extended beyond

these limits as required to mitigate landslide and erosion hazards, or as otherwise necessary to protect public health, safety and welfare.

iv. The buffer may be reduced when an applicant demonstrates, pursuant to a special site analysis/report using best available science, that the reduction will adequately protect the proposed development and the critical area.

v. Building Setback Lines. A building setback line will be established at a minimum distance of fifteen (15) feet from the edge of the buffer.

2. Landslide Hazard
   a. Site analysis/Report - required to identify and quantify geologic, topographic and hydrologic factors that might contribute to slope instability. The rate and extent of potential hazards to development activity must be assessed and mitigation measures, if any, evaluated. The proposed development must be analyzed in light of the hazards and effects represented by the landslide exposure on proposed private and public investments. Development operational factors should be included in the analysis to account for the effects of residential landscape irrigation, storm water generation from impervious surfaces and the influence of street conveyance on slope stability.
   b. Development Standards
      i. Documented landslide hazard areas shall be avoided as locations for building construction, roads or utility systems where mitigation is not feasible.
      ii. If the degree of hazard warrants some development activity, post construction slope stabilization and appropriately upgraded road construction specifications shall be employed to eliminate as completely as practicable, any public or private exposure to landslide hazards or abnormal maintenance or repair costs.

E. Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas
   1. Site analysis/Report - required to identify endangered, threatened, sensitive species, species and habitats of local importance and the nature and extent of their primary association with the habitat conservation area. The investigation shall include relative density and species richness, breeding, habitat, seasonal range dynamics and movement corridors. The analysis shall address the relative tolerance by species of human activities. The development proposal shall be evaluated in terms of its influence on the above wildlife factors and recommend mitigation measures for any area that would potentially degrade base-line populations and reproduction rates over the long term.
   2. Development Standards
      a. No development approval shall be granted unless mitigation of adverse effects can be provided that will ensure continuation of base-line

populations for all endangered, threatened and sensitive species.

b. Development may be allowed when only species and habitats of local importance will suffer population declines or interruption of migration routes provided that adequate regional populations are maintained.
c. Development reviews shall include regional species occurrence and movements and will avoid creating isolated sub-populations where warranted.

SECTION 7
WARNING AND DISCLAIMER OF LIABILITY

7.1 Warning and Disclaimer of Liability

The degree of hazard protection required by this chapter is considered reasonable for regulatory purposes and is based on scientific and engineering considerations. Catastrophic natural disasters can, and will, occur on rare occasions. This chapter does not imply that land outside the critical areas or activities permitted within such areas will be free from exposure or damage. This chapter shall not create liability on the part of the City of Wenatchee, and officers or employees thereof, for any damages that result from reliance on this chapter or any administrative decision lawfully made hereunder.

Exhibit A of Appendix B, of the City of Wenatchee Shoreline Master Program

8D.2.3 Buffer Alternative 3: Width Based on Wetland Category, Intensity of Impacts, Wetland Functions, or Special Characteristics

The third alternative provides the most flexibility by basing the widths of buffers on three factors: the wetland category, the intensity of the impacts (as used in Alternative 2), and the functions or special characteristics of the wetland that need to be protected as determined through the rating system. The recommended widths for buffers are shown in Tables 8D-4 to 8D-7. Using this alternative, a wetland may fall into more than one category in the table. For example, a forested, riparian, wetland may be rated a Category II wetland because it is a riparian forest, but it may be rated a Category I wetland based on its score for functions.

If a wetland meets more than one of the characteristics listed in Tables 8D-4 to 8D-7, the buffer recommended to protect the wetland is the widest one. For example, if a Category I wetland (Table 8D-7) scores 32 points for habitat and 27 points for water quality functions, a 200-foot buffer is needed for land uses with high impacts because the widths needed to protect habitat are wider than those needed for the other functions.

Table 8D-4. Width of buffers needed to protect Category IV wetlands in eastern Washington (Buffer Alternative 3 for wetlands scoring less than 30 points for all functions).

Wetland Characteristics	Buffer Widths by Impact of Proposed Land Use	Other Measures Recommended for Protection
Score for all 3 basic functions is less than 30 points	Low - 25 ft Moderate – 40 ft High – 50 ft	No recommendations at this time[1]

Table 8D-5. Width of buffers needed to protect Category III wetlands in eastern Washington (Buffer Alternative 3 for wetlands scoring 30 – 50 points for all functions or isolated vernal pools).

Wetland Characteristics	Buffer Widths by Impact of Proposed Land Use	Other Measures Recommended for Protection
Moderate level of function for habitat (score for habitat 20 - 28 points)	Low - 75 ft Moderate – 110 ft High – 150 ft	No recommendations at this time[1]
Not meeting above characteristic	Low - 40 ft Moderate – 60 ft High – 80 ft	No recommendations at this time[1]

[1] No information on other measures for protection was available at the time this document was written. The Washington State Department of Ecology will continue to collect new information for future updates to this document.

Table 8D-6. Width of buffers needed to protect Category II wetlands in eastern Washington (Buffer Alternative 3 for wetlands scoring 51-69 points for all functions or having the "Special Characteristics" identified in the rating system).

Wetland Characteristics	Buffer Widths by Impact of Proposed Land Use (apply most protective if more than one criterion is met)	Other Measures Recommended for Protection
High level of function for habitat (score for habitat 29 - 36 points)	Low - 100 ft Moderate – 150 ft High – 200 ft	Maintain connections to other habitat areas
Moderate level of function for habitat (score for habitat 20 - 28 points)	Low - 75 ft Moderate – 110 ft High – 150 ft	No recommendations at this time[2]
High level of function for water quality improvement and low for habitat (score for water quality 24 - 32 points; habitat less than 20 points)	Low - 50 ft Moderate – 75 ft High – 100 ft	No additional surface discharges of untreated runoff
Vernal pool	Low - 100 ft Moderate – 150 ft High – 200 ft OR Develop a regional plan to protect the most important vernal pool complexes – buffers of vernal pools outside protection zones can then be reduced to: Low - 40 ft Moderate – 60 ft High – 80 ft	No intensive grazing or tilling in the wetland
Riparian forest	Buffer width to be based on score for habitat functions or water quality functions	Riparian forest wetlands need to be protected at a watershed or sub-basin scale (protection of the water regime in the watershed) Other protection based on needs to protect habitat and/or water quality functions
Not meeting above characteristics	Low - 50 ft Moderate – 75 ft High – 100 ft	No recommendations at this time[2]

[2] See footnote on the previous page.

Table 8D-7. Width of buffers needed to protect Category I wetlands in eastern Washington (Buffer Alternative 3 for wetlands scoring 70 points or more for all functions or having the "Special Characteristics" identified in the rating system).

Wetland Characteristics	Buffer Widths by Impact of Proposed Land Use (apply most protective if more than one criterion is met)	Other Measures Recommended for Protection
Natural Heritage Wetlands	Low - 125 ft Moderate – 190 ft High – 250 ft	No additional surface discharges to wetland or its tributaries No septic systems within 300 ft Restore degraded parts of buffer
Bogs	Low - 125 ft Moderate – 190 ft High – 250 ft	No additional surface discharges to wetland or its tributaries Restore degraded parts of buffer
Forested	Buffer size to be based on score for habitat functions or water quality functions	If forested wetland scores high for habitat, need to maintain connectivity to other natural areas Restore degraded parts of buffer
Alkali	Low – 100 ft Moderate – 150 ft High – 200 ft	No additional surface discharges to wetland or its tributaries Restore degraded parts of buffer
High level of function for habitat (score for habitat 29 - 36 points)	Low – 100 ft Moderate – 150 ft High – 200 ft	Maintain connections to other habitat areas Restore degraded parts of buffer
Moderate level of function for habitat (score for habitat 20 - 28 points)	Low – 75 ft Moderate – 110 ft High – 150 ft	No recommendations at this time[3]
High level of function for water quality improvement (24 – 32 points) and low for habitat (less than 20 points)	Low – 50 ft Moderate – 75 ft High – 100 ft	No additional surface discharges of untreated runoff
Not meeting any of the above characteristics	Low – 50 ft Moderate – 75 ft High – 100 ft	No recommendations at this time[3]

[3] See footnote on page 6.